

Appl. No. 09/328,667

Attorney Docket No.: 113394

REMARKS

Claims 1-5, 7-15, 17-25 and 27-30 remain pending in this application. These claims stand rejected under 35 USC 102(a) as anticipated by Galasso or as unpatentable over Galasso in view of Sengodan under 35 USC 103.

Independent Claims 1, 11 and 21

Each of the independent claims in the application—claims 1, 11 and 21—have been amended. As such they are believed to distinguish the invention from Galasso.

The Office action has stated that the claims as previously presented can be read on Galasso because the recitation of the first and third gatekeepers being at the same hierarchical level can, broadly speaking, be said to read on the relationship between Galasso's US master gatekeeper 550 and the zone gatekeeper within Galasso's zone 510.

Whether or not it is appropriate to read the claims on Galasso in that way, amended claims 1, 11 and 21 have now been amended in such a way as to distinguish the invention from Galasso, even under that interpretation.

In particular, claims 1, 11 and 21 as amended are now more particularly directed to an architecture such as that shown in FIG. 4 of applicant's specification wherein the so-called first gatekeeper has at least two functions. One function is to receive requests from other gatekeepers. The other function is to receive and respond to requests from subscriber terminals without such requests being sent through any other gatekeeper. More concretely, in the illustrative embodiment of FIG. 4, gatekeeper 420b corresponds to the recited "first" gatekeeper. It receives and responds to requests from gatekeeper 420a. It also receives and responds to requests from subscriber terminal 421a without those requests having been sent through any other gatekeeper.

Applicant has made this limitation manifest in the claims by amending them to call for two different types of information requests. The "second" request in these claims is the request that has been present in the claims all along. It is a request that passes from the third gatekeeper (e.g., 420a) through the first gatekeeper (e.g., 420b)

Appl. No. 09/328,667

Attorney Docket No.: 113394

and thence to a second gatekeeper (e.g., 420d, 420e or 420f) through an intermediate gatekeeper (e.g., 420c).

Claims 1, 11 and 21, however, now additionally call for a first request that is also received by the first gatekeeper. This first request is one that is received from the subscriber terminal without passing through any other gatekeeper. In FIG. 4, then, this would correspond to a request received by gatekeeper 420b that originated from subscriber terminal 421a.

Turning now to Galasso, one sees that the US master gatekeeper 550 does not meet the aforementioned additional requirement imposed by the claims on the “first” gatekeeper. US master gatekeeper 550 communicates only with other gatekeepers.

In view of the foregoing, the US master gatekeeper 550 of Galasso cannot be said to correspond to applicant’s recited “first” gatekeeper because there is no instance in Galasso of master gatekeeper 550 receiving a first request for information from a subscriber terminal “without said first request having been sent through any other gatekeeper.”

Claims 11 and 21 have been amended to refer to “at least one” intermediate gatekeeper.

Dependent Claims

Various ones of the dependent claims have been amended to conform their language to that of claims 1, 11 or 21, as amended. Each of these claims is submitted to be allowable at least for the reasons set forth above relative to their respective base claims 1, 11 and 21.

It is also noted that claims 3, and 23 have been amended to correct a minor error, changing “steps” to “step.”


Appl. No. 09/328,667

Attorney Docket No.: 113394

In view of all of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that each of applicant's claims distinguishes the invention from the prior art and is in condition for allowance.

Reconsideration is therefore requested.

Respectfully,
Radhika R. Roy

By: 

Ronald D. Slusky
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 26,585
(212) 246-4546

Office of Ronald D. Slusky
Registered Patent Attorney
353 West 56th St.—Suite 5L
New York, N.Y. 10019-3775
Date: 05/17/2005